



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,040	07/17/2006	Jorg Berthold	1890-0274	6036
50255	7590	01/15/2009		
MAGINOT, MOOR & BECK 111 MONUMENT CIRCLE, SUITE 3000 BANK ONE CENTER/TOWER INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204			EXAMINER	
			ROJAS, DANIEL E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2816	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/15/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/563,040	Applicant(s) BERTHOLD ET AL.
	Examiner DANIEL ROJAS	Art Unit 2816

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 24 and 26-39 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 24 and 26-39 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-146/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to section II of Applicant's Remarks have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 of claim 30 has been withdrawn.
2. Applicant's arguments filed 10/23/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. In regards to section III of Applicant's Remarks, examiner indicated that it would have been obvious to place a capacitor connected to the output of the master latch and ground to serve as a noise filter. Connected in this arrangement, the said capacitor would act as a programmable capacitor since the charging/discharging of said capacitor is controlled (i.e. programmed) by said master latch. The motivation to combine said capacitor with said master latch is to reduce noise. Kampes (US Patent No. 4,737,735) teaches the use of a capacitor (50, Figure 1) connected to ground in order to reduce noise (column 3, lines 14-16). Therefore, the claim would have been obvious because the technique for improving a particular class of devices (i.e. circuits vulnerable to electrical interference or jitter) was part of the ordinary capabilities of a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, in view of the teaching of the technique for improvement in other situations.
4. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208

USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Therefore, in regards to the section titled “A First Isolating circuit...and...A Second Isolating Circuit,” the arguments against the prior art as shown in Figure 4 are moot. Furthermore, in response to applicant’s argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, both Klass and AAPA teach the use of static slave latches. Klass’ Figure 3 requires a static output stage which is capable of receiving a signal and outputting a non-inverting output. AAPA’s TG, slave latch, and output inverter comprise a static output stage. Therefore, all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention.

5. In response to the section titled “Delayed and Inverted Clock Signal,” in Klass’ Figure 4, when CK changes from high to low, both inputs of 401 will be high for a first time substantially equal to the difference between CKD and CK. This would cause the voltage at S to be low for said first time and then revert to being high after said first time. When CK changes from low to high, both inputs of 401 will be low for a second time

substantially equal to the difference between CKD and CK. This would cause the voltage at S to be high for said second time and then revert to being low after said first time. Therefore, during said first and second time, signal S is a delayed and inverted clock signal. Applicant further argues that "input stage 301 shown in Fig. 4 of Klass cannot be used as a signal level displacement circuit for a flip flop." The use of a signal level displacement circuit for a flip flop relates merely to the intended use of the signal level displacement circuit and fails to further distinguish applicant's invention over the prior art.

6. In response to section IV, the term "master latch circuit" means any circuit which comprises a master latch and additional circuits used with the master latch. Therefore, a signal delay circuit, circuit node, and a programmable capacitor network can be considered to be additional circuits within a master latch circuit since their output is dependent upon the master latch. Applicant argues that "an inverter usually comprises at least two complementary transistors." It is noted that when the clock signal is high, the drain of P1 is low and when the clock signal is low, the drain of P1 is high. Hence, from gate to drain, there is an inversion of said clock signal. An inverter is known to be anything which inverts a signal and is not restricted to be a complementary CMOS implementation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. Claims 24, 26-34 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klass (US Patent No. 5,917,355) in view of applicant admitted prior art (applicant's Figure 4), hereinafter referred to as Klass and AAPA, respectively.

10. For claim 27, Klass's invention as shown in his Figure 4 comprises a signal delay circuit (INV1) configured to generate a delayed clock signal (output of INV1) corresponding to the clock signal (CK) delayed by a time delay (INV1 has a constant inherent delay) but fails to teach the said circuit node, a programmable capacitor unit, a first isolating circuit and a second isolating circuit. However, examiner takes official notice that it is notoriously old and well known that a capacitor connected to ground at an output to any circuit serves as a filter. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a capacitor directly connected between ground and node X of Klass's invention in order to filter noise.

Thus, the combination circuit of Klass's invention with the capacitor as described above comprises a circuit node (X) arranged to charge a capacitor (C) in a charging phase in response to the clock signal being logically low (as explained below) and to discharge in

an evaluation phase depending on a data signal in response to the clock signal being logically high and the delayed clock signal being logically high; and a programmable capacitor unit coupling the circuit node (X, Figure 4 above) to a reference potential (ground). For Figure 4 above, when the clock signal is logically low, transistor P1 is on, allowing capacitor C to charge. The capacitor C discharges only when the clock signal (CK), input D, and the delayed clock signal (CKD) are both high. AAPA teaches a latch circuit (slave latch and the transmission gate TG). Therefore, it would have been obvious to substitute Klass's slave latch (303) with AAPA's slave latch (slave latch and TG) since it has been held that the substitution of one known element for another would have yielded predictable results one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention (as explained below). Both Klass' slave latch (303) and AAPA's slave latch receive an output signal from a dynamic master latch and hold the logical value at the output based on the clock signal. Therefore, the combination of the modified version of Klass (with a capacitor, as defined above) with AAPA's circuit comprises a first isolating circuit (TG) configured to be clocked by the clock signal and having an input connected to the circuit node (as described above); a second isolating circuit (clocked inverter within the slave latch) configured and arranged to be clocked by the delayed clock signal (as described below); wherein an output of the first isolating circuit feeds back to the input of the first isolating circuit via the second isolating circuit (as shown). The delayed clock signal (output of INV1) is equal to the clock signal received by the second isolation circuit (inverted input terminal receiving the clock signal).

11. For claim 24, the combination of Klass and AAPA as defined above further teaches that the circuit node is arranged to discharge in the evaluation phase in response to the data signal being logically high and the circuit node is arranged to not discharge in the evaluation phase in response to the data signal being logically low (inherent based upon the structure).
12. For claim 26, the combination of Klass and AAPA as defined above further teaches a slave latch circuit (slave latch); wherein the first isolating circuit has an output connected to the slave latch circuit (as shown), the first isolating circuit is configured to generate an output signal at the output, and the slave latch circuit is configured to buffer-store the output signal (inherent based upon the structure).
13. For claim 28, the combination circuit of Klass and AAPA as defined above inherently teaches the signal delay circuit, the circuit node, and the programmable capacitor unit being incorporated into a master latch.
14. For claim 29, the combination of Klass and AAPA as defined above further teaches that the master latch circuit further includes an inverter (P1, as explained below) configured to generate an and inverted clock signal corresponding to an inversion of the clock signal (as explained below); the master latch circuit further includes a first controllable switch (401) driven by the inverted clock signal; and the first controllable switch switches the operating voltage to the circuit node in response to the clock signal being logically low (inherent based upon the structure). When the clock signal is high, the output of P1 will be low. When the clock signal is low, the output of P1 will be high. Therefore, P1 acts as an inverter. Nand gate 401 is a switch controlled

by two inputs wherein it is inherently controlled by the output of P1. Therefore, nand gate 401 is driven by the inverted clock signal (produced by P1).

15. For claim 30, the combination of Klass and AAPA as defined above further teaches that the master latch circuit further includes a reference potential node (source terminal of N3) configured to be coupled to a reference potential (ground); the master latch circuit further includes a second, third and fourth controllable switches, the second (N1), third (N2) and fourth (N3) controllable switches being connected in series with one another between a voltage supply (VDD) and the reference potential node (as shown).

16. For claim 31, the combination of Klass and AAPA as defined above further teaches that the master latch circuit is configured to generate a delayed inverted clock signal (via P1, as explained below) and to drive the second controllable switch with the delayed inverted clock signal (as explained below). When the clock signal is high, the output of P1 will be low. When the clock signal is low, the output of P1 will be high. Therefore, P1 acts as an inverter. It is noted that there is a constant inherent delay caused by the switching of P1. Nand gate 401 is a switch controlled by two inputs wherein it is inherently controlled by the output of P1. Since the output of 401 controls the second controllable switch, the output of P1 inherently drives the second controllable switch.

17. For claim 32, the combination of Klass and AAPA as defined above further teaches that the third controllable switch is arranged to be driven by the data signal (D, as shown).

18. For claim 33, the combination of Klass and AAPA as defined above further teaches that the fourth controllable switch is arranged to be driven by the clock signal (CK, as shown).
19. For claim 34, the combination of Klass and AAPA as defined above further teaches that the capacitor is connected in parallel with the second, third and fourth controllable switches (inherent, as explained above).
20. For claim 37, the combination of Klass and AAPA as defined above further teaches that a circuit that is capable of use wherein the master latch circuit is configured to make the time delay less than a time period of the clock signal (the functionality does not define the structure over the prior art).
21. For claim 38, the combination of Klass and AAPA as defined above teaches the limitations of claim 28 but fails to teach that the signal delay circuit comprises a plurality of inverter delay stages. It is known that adding a plurality of delay stages would increase the delay value. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use a plurality of inverter delay stages to increase the delay time. Furthermore, it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).
22. For claim 39, the combination of Klass and AAPA as defined above inherently teaches that the master latch circuit is configured to receive only a single supply voltage.

23. Claims 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klass.

24. For claim 35, Klass's invention as shown in his Figure 4 comprises a signal delay circuit (INV1) configured to generate a delayed clock signal (output of INV1) corresponding to the clock signal (CK) delayed by a time delay (INV1 has a constant inherent delay) but fails to teach the said circuit node and a programmable capacitance unit. However, examiner takes official notice that it is notoriously old and well known that a capacitor connected to ground at an output to any circuit serves as a filter. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a capacitor directly connected between ground and node X of Klass's invention in order to filter noise. Thus, the combination circuit of Klass's invention with the capacitor as described above comprises a circuit node (X) arranged to charge a capacitor (C) in a charging phase in response to the clock signal being logically low (as explained below) and to discharge in an evaluation phase depending on a data signal in response to the clock signal being logically high and the delayed clock signal being logically high; and a capacitor with a programmable capacitance (see paragraph 4 of this action) coupling the circuit node (X, Figure 4 above) to a reference potential (ground). For Figure 4 above, when the clock signal is logically low, transistor P1 is on, allowing capacitor C to charge. The capacitor C discharges only when the clock signal (CK), input D, and the delayed clock signal (CKD) are both high. It is inherent from the structure of the combination that the signal delay circuit, the circuit node, and the programmable capacitor unit are incorporated into a master latch circuit.

However, the modified version of Klass (i.e. adding the capacitor) fails to teach that the time delay is adjustable. However, it is known to use a variable delay line in place of a constant delay in order to increase the flexibility of the circuit. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to replace Klass' inverter INV1 with a variable delay line since it has been held that the provision of adjustability, where needed, involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Stevens*, 101 USPQ 284 (CCPA 1954).

25. For claim 36, Klass's invention as shown in his Figure 4 comprises a signal delay circuit (INV1) configured to generate a delayed clock signal (output of INV1) corresponding to the clock signal (CK) delayed by a time delay (INV1 has a constant inherent delay) but fails to teach the said circuit node and a programmable capacitance unit. However, examiner takes official notice that it is notoriously old and well known that a capacitor connected to ground at an output to any circuit serves as a filter. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a capacitor directly connected between ground and node X of Klass's invention in order to filter noise. Thus, the combination circuit of Klass's invention with the capacitor as described above comprises a circuit node (X) arranged to charge a capacitor (C) in a charging phase in response to the clock signal being logically low (as explained below) and to discharge in an evaluation phase depending on a data signal in response to the clock signal being logically high and the delayed clock signal being logically high; and a capacitor with a programmable capacitance (see paragraph 4 of this action) coupling the circuit node (X, Figure 4 above) to a reference

potential (ground). For Figure 4 above, when the clock signal is logically low, transistor P1 is on, allowing capacitor C to charge. The capacitor C discharges only when the clock signal (CK), input D, and the delayed clock signal (CKD) are both high. It is inherent from the structure of the combination that the signal delay circuit, the circuit node, and the programmable capacitor unit are incorporated into a master latch circuit; wherein during the evaluation phase the capacitor discharges with a time constant in response to the data signal being logically high and the time constant is less than the time delay (the modified version of Klass as defined above is capable of performing this function and therefore does not distinguish the structure over the prior art).

Conclusion

26. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANIEL ROJAS whose telephone number is (571)270-

5070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30-8 EST, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lincoln Donovan can be reached on 571-272-1988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tuan Lam/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2816

/D. R./
Examiner, Art Unit 2816